



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,889	11/27/2000	Henry F. Lada	200301796-1	6088

22879 7590 03/06/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

YANCHUS III, PAUL B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2116

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/722,889	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LADA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Paul B. Yanchus	<b>Art Unit</b> 2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,12-14 and 16-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26 and 28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-9, 12-14 and 16-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

This final office action is in response to communications filed on 12/20/05.

For Applicant's convenience, the previous rejections are provided below.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-14 and 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shih et al, US Patent no. 6,405,362 [Shih] and Mills et al., US Patent no. 6,353,870 [Mills], in view of, Kirinaka, US Patent no. 6,052,742.

Regarding claim 1, Shih teaches a method comprising:

coupling an option pack [Compact Flash, PCMCIA memory card or other removable computer readable medium] to a main unit [Palm-size PC, column 6, lines 43-46],

the option pack comprising a first memory device configured to store one or more applications and drivers associated with the one or more applications [column 6, lines 9-20],

the main unit comprising a device manager [operating system, column 6, lines 20-25], a power supply and a third memory [column 4, lines 49-51 and Figure 1]; and

downloading the one or more applications and associated drivers from the first memory device to the third memory device [column 7, lines 20-23 and lines 55-61].

Shih does not explicitly specifically disclose a second memory device on the option pack that stores card identification data and is different from the first memory device. Shih does state that the option pack may be any well known removable computer medium [column 6, lines 43-46]. Mills discloses a known MultiMediaCard, which includes a first memory for storing application data [Memory Core in Figure 3A] and a second memory, which is different from the first memory, that stores card identification data [CID and CSD in Figures 3A and 3B]. Mills discloses that the CID and CSD registers contain information that is needed for the card to interface with host computers [Figure 3B].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the Mills MultimediaCard as the removable computer medium disclosed by Shih as it is a known removable computer medium capable of fulfilling Shih's goal of providing additional functionality to a Palm-size PC.

Shih and Mills disclose a method of coupling an option pack to a main unit and transmitting identification data from the option pack to the main unit. Shih and Mills do not disclose transmitting the identification data from the option pack to the main unit before the option pack is fully powered. Kirinaka discloses transmitting identification data [physical specification of the operational voltage] from an option pack [expansion card] to a main unit [host machine] before the option pack is fully powered. After the identification data is received, the main unit supplies a full power to the option pack based on the received identification data [column 3, line 33 – column 4, line 11]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Shih and Mills method to transmit card identification data from the option pack to the main unit before the option pack is fully powered in order to increase the flexibility

Art Unit: 2116

of the method by enabling the main unit to function with option packs that have different operational voltages without the risk of supplying inappropriate operational voltages and harming the option packs.

Regarding claim 2, Shih states that the option pack may be any well known removable computer medium [column 6, lines 43-46].

Regarding claim 4, Shih discloses a driver for overseeing the interaction between that main unit and the option pack [shell and event manager, column 6, lines 28-31 and 41-45].

Regarding claim 5, Shih states that the option pack may be a Compact Flash card [column 6, lines 43-46].

Regarding claim 6, Mills states that known removable expansion cards contain ROM [column 1, lines 19-21].

Regarding claim 7, Shih teaches that the installed applications from the option pack are deleted when the option pack is removed [column 7, lines 23-28 and lines 62-67]. Therefore, the memory in the main unit will not comprise the option pack applications when the card is inserted.

Regarding claim 8, Shih teaches that the installed applications from the option pack are deleted when the option pack is removed [column 7, lines 23-28 and lines 62-67].

Regarding claim 9, Shih teaches that the installed applications from the option pack are deleted when the option pack is removed [column 7, lines 20-28 and lines 62-67].

Regarding claim 12, Shih teaches that the installed applications from the option pack are deleted when the option pack is removed [column 7, lines 20-28 and lines 62-67].

Art Unit: 2116

Regarding claim 13, Mills teaches that the CID and CSD registers contain option card configuration and identification information [Figure 3B].

Regarding claim 14, Mills teaches that the MultimediaCard communicates data to the main unit through a single data pin [DAT in Figure 3]. Therefore, any information transferred from the MultimediaCard to the main unit must be done serially.

Regarding claims 16 and 18, Shih, Mills and Kirinaka do not explicitly teach determining whether the power supply in the main unit has enough power to activate the option pack fully. However, the Examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to determine whether a power supply has enough power to fully perform a function before attempting to complete the function. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine whether the power supply in the main unit has enough power to activate the option pack fully before attempting to activate the option to prevent the activation process from being stopped prematurely due to power deficiencies.

Regarding claims 17 and 19, Shih, Mills and Kirinaka do not explicitly teach determining whether the third memory space has enough memory capacity to receive the applications and associated drivers stored on the first memory. However, the Examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to determine whether a first memory has enough memory capacity to completely save data copied from a second memory before attempting to copy the data. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine whether the third memory space has enough memory capacity to receive the applications and associated drivers stored on the first memory to prevent wasted time and power

Art Unit: 2116

consumption of attempting to copy data to the third memory when it does not have enough memory capacity.

Regarding claim 20, Shih teaches a method of connecting an option pack to a main unit comprising:

powering on the main unit and determining if there is an option pack coupled to the main unit [column 6, lines 41-51 and column 8, lines 10-18];

providing an interrupt signal from the option pack to the main unit, interrupting the processing of the main unit and notifying the main unit that the option pack is present [column 6, lines 32-40 and 42-46]; and

downloading one or more software applications and associated drivers from the option pack to the main unit [column 7, lines 20-23 and lines 55-61].

Shih does not explicitly specifically disclose a second memory device on the option pack that stores card identification data and is different from the first memory device. Shih does state that the option pack may be any well known removable computer medium [column 6, lines 43-46]. Mills discloses a known MultiMediaCard, which includes a first memory for storing application data [Memory Core in Figure 3A] and a second memory, which is different from the first memory, that stores card identification data [CID and CSD in Figures 3A and 3B]. Mills discloses that the CID and CSD registers contain information that is needed for the card to interface with host computers [Figure 3B].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the Mills MultimediaCard as the removable computer medium disclosed by Shih as it is a known

Art Unit: 2116

removable computer medium capable of fulfilling Shih's goal of providing additional functionality to a Palm-size PC.

Shih and Mills disclose a method of coupling an option pack to a main unit and transmitting identification data from the option pack to the main unit. Shih and Mills do not disclose transmitting the identification data from the option pack to the main unit before the option pack is fully powered. Kirinaka discloses transmitting identification data [physical specification of the operational voltage] from an option pack [expansion card] to a main unit [host machine] before the option pack is fully powered. After the identification data is received, the main unit supplies a full power to the option pack based on the received identification data [column 3, line 33 – column 4, line 11]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Shih and Mills method to transmit card identification data from the option pack to the main unit before the option pack is fully powered in order to increase the flexibility of the method by enabling the main unit to function with option packs that have different operational voltages without the risk of supplying inappropriate operational voltages and harming the option packs.

Regarding claim 21, Shih, Mills and Kirinaka, as described above, teach that the option pack is inserted into main unit while the main unit is powered on. Therefore, the option pack is being hot-plugged into the main unit.

Regarding claims 22 and 23, Shih, Mills and Kirinaka do not explicitly teach determining whether the power supply in the main unit has enough power to activate the option pack fully. However, the Examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to determine whether a power supply has enough power to fully perform a function before

Art Unit: 2116

attempting to complete the function and notifying a user if there is not enough power.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine whether the power supply in the main unit has enough power to activate the option pack fully before attempting to activate the option to prevent the activation process from being stopped prematurely due to power deficiencies.

Regarding claims 24 and 25, Shih, Mills and Kirinaka do not explicitly teach determining whether the third memory space has enough memory capacity to receive the applications and associated drivers stored on the first memory. However, the Examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to determine whether a first memory has enough memory capacity to completely save data copied from a second memory before attempting to copy the data and notifying a user if there is not enough memory capacity. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine whether the third memory space has enough memory capacity to receive the applications and associated drivers stored on the first memory to prevent wasted time and power consumption of attempting to copy data to the third memory when it does not have enough memory capacity.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 26 and 28 are allowed.

#### *Response to Arguments*

Applicants' arguments filed 12/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2116

As described in the 12/20/05 Remarks, Applicants “seasonably traverse and challenge Examiner’s use of Official Notice” and “respectfully request objective evidence, such as additional reference, in support of the Examiner’s position if the reject is to be maintained.” For objective evidence, shown in additional references, in support of the Examiner’s position, Examiner directs Applicants to the final office action mailed on 4/11/2005. The 4/11/2005 office action clearly provides objective evidence, shown in additional references, in support of the Examiner’s position. For Applicant’s convenience, the evidence is provided below:

Regarding claims 16, 18, 22 and 23, Applicant challenges the official notice taken by the examiner and argues that determining whether a power supply has enough power to fully perform a function before attempting to complete the function is not well known in the art.

To support the assertion that determining whether a power supply has enough power to fully perform a function before attempting to complete the function is well known in the art, the examiner submits Yamagata, US Patent no. 6,609,072. Yamagata discloses a method of determining whether a battery has enough remaining capacity to carry out an input or output of data and allowing the input or output of data execute if the remaining capacity is sufficient [column 4, lines 32-45].

To further support the assertion that determining whether a power supply has enough power to fully perform a function before attempting to complete the function is well known in the art, the examiner submits Hayasaka, US Patent no. 5,845,142. Hayasaka discloses a method of comparing a residual battery capacity with a power necessary for communication and allowing the communication if the residual battery capacity is high enough [column 4, line 60 – column 5, line 39].

Regarding claims 17, 19, 24 and 25, Applicant challenges the official notice taken by the examiner and argues that determining whether a first memory has enough memory capacity to completely save data copied from a second memory before attempting to copy the data onto the first memory is not well known in the art.

To support the assertion that determining whether a first memory has enough memory capacity to completely save data copied from a second memory before attempting to copy the data onto the first memory is well known in the art, the examiner submits Otsuka et al., US Patent no. 6,201,771 [Otsuka]. Otsuka discloses verifying that a disk has enough capacity to store all data to be downloaded before downloading the data from another memory [column 22, lines 28-47].

Applicants also “challenge the Examiner to produce objective evidence of the requisite motivation or suggestion to combine the cited references.” For objective evidence of the requisite motivation or suggestion to combine the cited references, the Examiner directs the Applicants to lines 60-66 in column 6 of the Kirinaka reference. Specifically Kirinaka states that in an ordinary method, power is supplied to the option pack as soon as it is connected to the main

Art Unit: 2116

unit. Kirinaka further states that a malfunction may occur if the option pack requires a voltage different from the voltage supplied by the main unit. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize that modifying Shih and Mills to incorporate the Kirinaka method of transmitting identification data from an option pack to a main unit before the option pack is fully powered and then supplying a full power to the option pack based on the received identification data prevents a malfunction of the option pack when the specification on the operating supply voltage for the main unit differs from that for the option pack.

Applicants also argue, "it is clear that both Mills and Shih references teach fully powering a card or peripheral device upon insertion of the card or peripheral device." Examiner agrees that that both Mills and Shih references teach fully powering a card or peripheral device upon insertion of the card or peripheral device and consequently do not disclose transmitting identification data from the option pack to the main unit before the option pack is fully powered. However, Kirinaka is relied upon to overcome this deficiency. As described above, Kirinaka discloses transmitting identification data from an option pack to a main unit before the option pack is fully powered and then supplying a full power to the option pack based on the received identification data.

Applicants further argue, "The combination of the Kirinaka reference with the teachings of the Mills and Shih references would require substantial reconstruction and redesign of the elements of the Shih and Mills references, as well as change the basic principles under which they were designed to operate." The Examiner disagrees. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one

Art Unit: 2116

or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Applicants also argue that the Examiner has used impermissible hindsight to combine the cited references to arrive at the claimed invention. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

The rejections to claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-14 and 16-25 are respectfully maintained.

### *Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2116

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul B. Yanchus whose telephone number is (571) 272-3678. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne H. Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Yanchus  
March 2, 2006

  
**LYNNE H. BROWNE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**